



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,444	03/26/2001	Markus Kimer	F-6919	9119

7590 11/12/2004

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, NY 10168

EXAMINER
----------

STRANGE, AARON N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 11/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/817,444 /

Applicant(s)

KIRNER, MARKUS

Examiner

Aaron Strange

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 September 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. The drawings are objected to because the figures are not clearly labeled. Most of the items are simply boxes labeled with a number. The figures should be labeled with text labels describing the components referred to. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 13,32,33,47,60,66, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

4. With regard to claims 13 and 47, the specification fails to sufficiently define a "call number" for a communication established through a computer. While the term appears in page 9, lines 19-20 of the present application, the definition is not clear. Fixed network connections do not have a "call number" associated with them, and the term is not defined in more detail. Clarification with regard to the meaning of the term is requested.

5. With regard to claims 32,33,66, and 67, a "settlement of accounts" system is not defined in the specification. It is unclear what components comprise a "settlement of accounts" system, or how it functions.

6. With further regard to claim 47, the specification fails to sufficiently describe how the "call number" may be entered by the user. Since the connection is established via a computer, based on page 9, lines 19-20 of the present application, the "call number" must be associated with a fixed network connection. It is not clear how the user would be able to enter identification information relating to the network connection.

7. With regard to claim 60, the specification fails to sufficiently describe that the electronic communications comprising hyperlinks enabling selection of context-specific information and help pages are transmitted over said code-specific information page. In page 6, line 21 to page 7, Line 10, the electronic communications comprising hyperlinks enabling selection of context-specific information and help pages are sent via email rather than over the code-specific information page.

8. With regard to claims 66 and 67, an "ordering and settlement of accounts and delivery" system is not defined in the specification. It is unclear what components comprise a "ordering and settlement of accounts and delivery" system, or how it functions.

9. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10. Claims 1-33, 43-68, and 73-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

11. The claims, particularly claims 1-33, are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. Some specific examples of unclear language are cited below, but the listing should not be interpreted as exhaustive.

Since claims 35-80 are clearer, and claim substantially identical subject matter as claims 1-33, claims 34-80 have been used in the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 below.

12. Regarding claim 1, the limitation "expanded by the input of a different access code by hyperlinks assigned to the latter" in line 7 is unclear. It is unclear if the different access code is entered in the same way as the first one or entered "by hyperlinks assigned to the latter". It is also unclear whether "the latter" is referring to the different access code, the user, or another element.

13. Further regarding claim 1, the limitation "can be called" in lines 7-8 is unclear. It is unclear what component "can be called".

Art Unit: 2153

14. Regarding claims 2,6, and 7 the phrase "preferably" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

15. Further regarding claim 2, the phrase "especially" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

16. Further regarding claim 7, the phrase "optionally" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase

17. With regard to claims 9 and 43, the limitation "linked over a hyperlink" is unclear. It is unclear if Applicant means when referring to a page being "linked over a hyperlink" to information. Based on page 16 of the present application, this has been interpreted to mean that the information contains hyperlinks and other information associated with the code.

18. All claims not individually rejected are rejected by virtue of their dependency from the above claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

19. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

20. Claims 34,36,42,68, and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cairns (US 6,173,267).

21. With regard to claims 34 and 68, Cairns discloses an Internet-based information and communication system, comprising: a central server arranged to provide a central access page for data entry on computers (Col 4, Lines 14-17); and information carriers distributable by at least one user (Fig 2, 12), each of said information carriers having a carrier-specific access code (password) (Fig 2, 16) associated with a code-specific information page (Fig 2, 14) assembled by said at least one user such that upon entry of said access code on said central access page when viewed on a computer, said code specific information page (page informing user if they won) associated with said entered access code is accessed (Col 4, Lines 10-16).



22. With regard to claim 36, Cairns further discloses that said information carriers are in the form of a card including an Internet address of said central access page and said access code (password) (Fig 2, 12).

23. With regard to claims 42 and 72, Cairns further discloses that said central server comprises a database of access codes and comparison means for comparing said entered access code with said access codes stored in said database and enabling access to said code-specific information page associated with said entered access code only when said entered access code is identical to one of said access codes in said database (Col 4, Lines 47-56).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

25. Claims 1,2,4,9,10,15-21,23-26,30-33,35,43,44,49-55,57-60,64-67,69,73,74, and 76-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cairns (US 6,173,267).

26. With regard to claims 1,35 and 69, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically

disclose that said code-specific information page is expandable by hyperlinks assigned to said code-specific information page.

However, using hyperlinks to expand the content available from a web page is well known in the art. Hyperlinks provide a way for one web page to direct a user to another web page through a simple click, rather than requiring them to manually enter the Internet address for that page.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use hyperlinks to expand the content available to the user through the code-specific information page. Hyperlinks are well known in the art as a means to redirect users to pages with additional content quickly and easily.

27. With regard to claim 2, Cairns further discloses that said information carriers are in the form of a card including an Internet address of said central access page and said access code (password) (Fig 2, 12).

28. With regard to claim 4, Cairns further discloses that the server has means for comparing the access code entered with an access code stored in the data base of the server, and in the event that the two codes are identical, provides access (Col 4, Lines 47-56).

29. With regard to claims 43 and 73, Cairns discloses an Internet-based information and communication system, comprising: codes issuable by at least one issuer

(password) (Fig 2, 14); and a central server arranged to receive transmissions of said codes from a user via a communication connection (Col 4, Lines 14-17) such that upon receipt of one of said codes, said central server facilitates a request in the Internet for a code-specific information page (Col 4, Lines 10-16). Cairns fails to specifically disclose that said code-specific information page is expandable by hyperlinks assigned to said code-specific information page.

However, using hyperlinks to expand the content available from a web page is well known in the art. Hyperlinks provide a way for one web page to direct a user to another web page through a simple click, rather than requiring them to manually enter the Internet address for that page.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use hyperlinks to expand the content available to the user through the code-specific information page. Hyperlinks are well known in the art as a means to redirect users to pages with additional content quickly and easily.

30. With regard to claims 44 and 74, Cairns further discloses that the communication connection is established through at least one of a mobile phone connection and an Internet connection (Col 4, Lines 10-14).

31. With regard to claim 49, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that the access password is transmitted to the user after an initial input of said code.

However, Cairns discloses that access to a secure area of an Internet site may be provided after the code is entered (Col 4, Lines 44-46). Securing areas of a website using a password is well known in the art and is the simplest way to secure web pages while allowing access from any client. Providing the password for the secure area only after the correct code has been entered would ensure that access would only be provided to users with the correct code.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit the access password to the user after an initial input of said code. This would ensure that users would only be able to gain access to secure areas of the web site after providing the correct code.

32. With regard to claims 50 and 51, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that the communication connection is established over a mobile phone or entering said code manually, acoustically, or by means of a bar code reader.

However, Cairns discloses that the system may be accessed using any Internet enabled device (Col 4, Lines 16-21). Internet enabled mobile phones are well known in the art, and are advantageous since they can provide Internet access in locations not served by conventional networks, such as an automobile. All mobile phones are capable of accepting input of alphanumeric codes via their keypad.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the communication to be established over a

mobile phone to transmit the code. Internet enabled mobile phones are a well known means to provide Internet access in locations not served by conventional networks, such an automobile.

33. With regard to claims 52 and 76, Cairns further discloses that said central server is arranged to transmit a confirmation to the user after said code is entered (status notification) (Col 4, 54-56).

34. With regard to claim 53, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that the confirmation is at least one of a voice notification and an SMS (short message service) notification.

However, SMS is a well known protocol to send messages to mobile phones. If the user accesses the central server via a mobile phone, as discussed regarding claim 50, sending an SMS message to confirm receipt of the code would be the preferred way to inform the user since SMS messages can be saved in the phone to provide proof of the confirmation.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to notify the confirm receipt of the code by sending the uses a SMS message. This allows the user to save the confirmation message to provide proof of the confirmation.

35. With regard to claims 54 and 77, Cairns further discloses that said code is a component of an advertising medium (Col 3, Lines 18-23).

36. With regard to claim 55, Cairns further discloses that the advertising medium is one of a plastic card, an advertising display, a poster, a sticker, and an imprint on goods (Col 3, Lines 18-31).

37. With regard to claim 57, Cairns further discloses that said code-specific information page comprises communications from said at least one issuer to the user (information regarding prizes won, promotions, etc) (Col 4, Lines 54-65).

38. With regard to claim 58, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that said code-specific information page includes hyperlinks linked to Internet pages of said at least one issuer.

However, Cairns discloses that the user is connected to an Internet site of the issuer upon entry of a correct code (Col 4, Lines 44-46). Internet sites are typically comprised of multiple pages. Therefore, the code-specific information page in the Internet site disclosed by Cairns almost certainly contains hyperlinks to Internet pages of at least one issuer. Nonetheless, using hyperlinks to other pages provided by the issuer in the code-specific information page is well known in the art and is done on almost every existing web page.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place hyperlinks to other Internet pages of the Issuer on the code-specific information page. This would have allowed the issuer to provide links to other information of interest to the user.

39. With regard to claims 59 and 78, Cairns further discloses means for sending (send contact information) (Col 3, Lines 28-46) and receiving (receive prize notification) (Col 4, Lines 54-65) electronic communications over said code-specific information page.

40. With regard to claim 60, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that the electronic communications comprise hyperlinks enabling selection of context-specific information and help pages.

However, using hyperlinks to expand the content available from an electronic communication such as an email is well known in the art. Hyperlinks provide a way to direct a user to a web page through a simple click, rather than requiring them to manually enter the Internet address for that page.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include hyperlinks in the electronic communications to enable selection of context-specific information and help pages. Hyperlinks are well

Art Unit: 2153

known in the art as a means to redirect users to pages with additional content quickly and easily.

41. With regard to claim 64, Cairns further discloses that communications of said at least one issuer are transmittable to the user as e-mail, an SMS (short message service) communication or by regular mail (Customers without Internet access can participate by mail) (Col 4, Lines 23-27).

42. With regard to claim 65, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that the communication connection between the user and the computer uses WAP, GPRS, or UMTS technology.

However, these protocols are well known protocols for digital communications via cellular devices. The use of these protocols would be advantageous since it allows users to communicate with the server using a mobile phone. Mobile phones are advantageous since they can provide Internet access in locations not served by conventional networks, such as an automobile

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the communication to be established over a mobile phone using well known protocols for cellular communications, such as WAP, GPRS, or UMTS. Internet enabled mobile phones are a well known means to provide Internet access in locations not served by conventional networks, such an automobile.



43. With regard to claim 66, Cairns further discloses that the system comprises an ordering and settlement of accounts and delivery system (Prize are redeemed and delivered to the winner (Fig 1).

44. With regard to claim 67, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that further discloses that the accounts are settled over a mobile phone.

However, Cairns discloses that the system may be accessed using any Internet enabled device (Col 4, Lines 16-21). Internet enabled mobile phones are well known in the art, and are advantageous since they can provide Internet access in locations not served by conventional networks, such as an automobile. All mobile phones are capable of accepting input of alphanumeric codes via their keypad.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the communication to be established over a mobile phone settle the accounts. Internet enabled mobile phones are a well known means to provide Internet access in locations not served by conventional networks, such an automobile.

45. Claims 9,10,15-21,23-26, and 30-33 are rejected for the reasons cited above for claims 43,44,49-55,57-60, and 65-67, respectively, since they recite substantially identical subject matter.

46. Claims 3,5,6,22,28,29,37,39,40,56,62,63, and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cairns (US 6,173,267) in view of Leason et al (US 6,251,017).

47. With regard to claim 37, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that said access code comprises a card number and a card code.

Leason teaches the combination of a card number (master-code) and a card code (sub-code) to generate a complete access code (validation code) (Col 6, Lines 11-25). By using a card number and a card code in combination to generate an access code, multiple pages may be assigned to a single card number based on the selected card code, allowing access to different pages based on the user's choice of card codes. This is particularly advantageous for lottery-style reward programs, since it adds excitement to the game by indirectly allowing the user to select which prize they will receive.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a card number and a card code in combination to generate the access code. This makes the game more exciting by introducing user interactivity in the prize selection process.

48. With regard to claim 39, Leason further discloses that said card code comprises at least one numbers and letters (Fig 1, 108).

49. With regard to claim 40, while the system disclosed by Cairns in view of Leason shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that said card number is at least a six digit number and said card code is at least a four-digit number.

However, Leason discloses that both the card number (master-code) and card code (sub-code) may be comprised of an arbitrary number of alphanumeric characters. Choosing at least a six digit number for the card number and a 4 digit number for the card code provides a very large number of unique combinations which would help prevent fraud caused by entering random numbers in an attempt to win prizes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use at least a 6 digit number for the card number and a 4 digit number for the card code because it would have provide a very large number of unique combinations which would help prevent fraud.

50. With regard to claim 56, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that the advertising medium is one of an Internet banner, a television or radio spot, and an email.

Leason teaches distributing game cards with access codes via an Internet advertising banner (Col 7, Lines 13-17). Distributing the cards online is a simple and inexpensive way to distribute the codes. Distributing codes via an Internet banner also

eliminates the cost incurred by manufacturing a physical card, reducing the cost of the promotion.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to advertise via Internet banners to distribute the access codes. Distributing codes via an Internet banner eliminates the cost incurred by manufacturing a physical card, reducing the cost of the promotion.

51. With regard to claims 62,63, and 80, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that said central server is arranged to assign a points account to each user and enable accumulation of points by the users based on actions of the users wherein the accumulation of points is payable in a monetary amount, in merchandise, or in telephone access time.

Leason teaches assigning a points account to each user and enabling accumulation of points by the users based on their actions (e-points are awarded for registering a validation code) (Col 3, Lines 64-66). The points may then be redeemed spent like money (Col 4, Lines 8-11). This allows users to get increased benefits by increasing their participation in the promotions, which increases the amount of advertising they are exposed to.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to assign a points account to a user and enable accumulation of points by the user that they can subsequently redeem for various

Art Unit: 2153

benefits. This promotes participation in an advertiser's promotions and allows users to get increased benefits by increasing participation in the promotion.

52. Claims 3,5,6,22,28, and 29 are rejected for the reasons cited above for claims 37,39,40,56,62, and 63, respectively, since they recite substantially identical subject matter.

53. Claims 7,8,38,41,70, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cairns (US 6,173,267) in view of Leason et al (US 6,251,017) in further view of Choi et al.

54. With regard to claims 38 and 70, while the system disclosed by Cairns in view of Leason shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that said card further includes a memory component in which at least one of said card number, said card code, and user-specific data is stored.

Choi teaches the use of a smart card device that contains a memory to hold user-specific information (Page 2, Lines 1-10). The smart card can securely hold large amounts of information and transmit the information to a card reader. Smart cards are particularly advantageous since they are secure and information such as the card number, card code, and user-specific data stored on them cannot be easily stolen. In contrast, if the information is printed on a card, someone may steal it simply by looking at it, and they could redeem the card without actually possessing it.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a card which includes a memory component to store at least one of said card number, said card code, and user-specific data. This allows the data to be kept secure and prevents someone from redeeming the card without actually possessing it.

55. With regard to claims 41 and 71, while the system disclosed by Cairns in view of Leason shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that said card is arranged such that upon insertion of said card in a card reader of a communication device connected with the Internet, said access code is transmitted and said code-specific information page assigned to said transmitted access code is accessed.

Choi teaches the use of a smart card device which contains a memory to hold user-specific information (Page 2, Lines 1-10). The smart card can securely hold large amounts of information and transmit the information to a card reader. Smart cards are particularly advantageous since they are secure and information on them cannot be easily stolen. Additionally, Choi discloses that a card reader may be set up so that information on them is automatically transmitted to a web site in order to access a customized web page. This is advantageous since it automatically connects the user to the correct page, and eliminates mistakes caused by typographical errors.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a card reader to automatically transmit the access

code to the server and provide the user with the code-specific information page in response to receiving the access code. This would have automatically connected the user to the correct page, and eliminated mistakes caused by typographical errors.

56. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected for the reasons cited above for claims 38 and 41, respectively, since they recite substantially identical subject matter.

57. Claim 11-14,45-48 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cairns (US 6,173,267) in view of White et al. (US 6,199,114).

58. With regard to claims 45 and 75, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically disclose that the communication connection is established through a computer adapted to automatically transfer an identification of the user to enable said central server to identify the user.

White teaches configuring a computer to automatically transfer an identification (silicon ID or SmartCard ID) of the user to enable a central server to identify the user (Col 7, Lines 8-11 and Col 9, Lines 1-17). This prevents access to a users account from systems that are not authorized to access it. Since users cannot change the ID of their client or SmartCard, this provides excellent security since a person must possess either the client or the SmartCard of a user in order to access their account.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure a computer to automatically transfer an

Art Unit: 2153

identification of the user to enable a central server to identify the user. This prevents access to a user's account by unauthorized clients.

59. With regard to claim 46, White further discloses that said computer is arranged to enable entry of the identification of the user by the user (SmartCard can be used to specify an identification) (Col 9, Lines 1-17).

60. With regard to claim 47, White further discloses that the identification of the user is a call number (silicon ID of WebTV Box) (Col 7, Lines 8-11).

61. With regard to claim 48, White further discloses that the identification of the user comprises an access password (multiple users of the same box are identified via username/password) (Col 7, Lines 19-29).

62. Claims 11-14 are rejected for the reasons cited above for claims 45-48, respectively, since they recite substantially identical subject matter.

63. Claim 27, 61, and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cairns (US 6,173,267) in view of Rangan (US 6,412,073).

64. With regard to claims 27, 61 and 79, while the system disclosed by Cairns shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to specifically



disclose that contents of said code-specific information pages are determinable and adjustable by the user.

Rangan teaches the customization of a portal based on user input. The system Disclosed by Rangan allows the user to add hyperlinks to various locations and provide login information associated with those logins (Col 2, Lines 10-20). This allows the user to access several sites from one central portal without requiring the user to log in at each page. This is very advantageous since it makes it much easier for a user to access secure areas of various websites. Cairns discloses allowing access to a secure area of a website once the correct access code/password has been entered (Cairns, Col 4, Lines 44-46). Combining the systems of Cairns and Rangan would have allowed the user to add login information for each code issuer to their code specific information page, allowing them to access all of the issuers' pages from a central location.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the user to determine and adjust the contents of their code-specific information page in order to allow them access to the web pages of the issuers of each code they receive from a central location.

**Conclusion**

65. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

66. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Strange whose telephone number is 571-272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ANS  
11/10/2004

*Bradley Edelman*  
Art Unit 2153